REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The arguments presented herein incorporate the arguments and amendments Applicants discussed with the Examiner during the phone interviews on May 17, 2007. Applicants submit that the arguments and amendments presented herein make the substance of the phone interview of record to comply with 37 CFR 1.133. The Examiner said he would reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and arguments, presented herein, and update the search. If the Examiner believes that further information on the interview needs to be made of record to comply with the requirements, Applicants request the Examiner to identify such further information.

1.   Claims 1, 7, and 13 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 7, and 13 as anticipated by Sollich (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,559). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Amended independent claims 1, 7, and 13 concern configuring a code assist function which suggests candidates responsive to a parsing of a partial program instruction statement to assist a programmer writing a computer program, and require: use in a computer system for configuring a code assist function which suggests candidates responsive to a parsing of a partial program instruction statement to assist a programmer writing a computer program, said article of manufacture comprising a computer-useable storage medium having a computer program embodied in said medium which causes the computer system to execute operations comprising: displaying a list of user-selectable preferences, wherein user selectable preferences provide different configurations to configure how the code assist function displays representations of proposed candidates for a partial program instruction, wherein different user selectable preferences specify different ways to display the representations of one proposed candidate for the partial program instruction; allowing a user to select one of the user-selectable preferences; storing the selected one of the user-selectable preferences; and configuring the code assist function to display the proposed candidates for a partial program instruction according to the configuration provided by the selected one of the user-selectable preferences responsive to a parsing of the partial program instruction statement.

Applicants amended these claims to recite that the candidates are suggested to assist a programmer writing a computer program. This requirement is disclosed on pg. 1, paras. [0006]

and [0008]. Applicants further amended these to recite that the user selectable preferences provide different configurations to configure how the code assist function displays representations of proposed candidates for a partial program instruction, wherein different user selectable preferences specify different ways to display the representations of one proposed candidate for the partial program instruction. These added requirements are disclosed on at least paras. [0051]-[0054] on pgs. 3-4.

During the interview, the Examiner indicated that the above amendments may distinguish over the cited art and that the Examiner would update his search. Applicants submit that the amended claims are patentable over the cited art for the following reasons.

With respect to the pre-amended claims 1, 7, and 13, the Examiner cited col. col. 7, lines 18-20 of Sollich. (Final Office Action, pgs. 4-7) Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

The cited col. 7 discusses the features of a code editor referred to as "Code Insight". The cited functions include a code completion function to display properties, methods and events for a class name from which the user can select. The Code Insight features are enabled, and the user invokes an Environment Options dialog box 400 in FIG. 4 to disable/re-enable and configure the features.

In the Remarks, the Examiner cited the "code completion" and "code parameters" features of the code insight as teaching the pre-amended claim requirements. (Final Office Action, pgs. 2-3) The cited "code completion" function mentions that when the user enters a class name followed by a period, a list of properties, methods and events appropriate to the class will be displayed and the user can then select the item to enter in the code. (col. 7, lines 25-30). Nowhere does this cited "code completion" function disclose or mention that different user selectable preferences specify different ways to display a representation of one proposed candidates for the partial program instruction, such that the selected user selectable preference is used to configure how the representation of the proposed candidate is displayed. Instead, the cited "code completion" function describes the use and function of "code insight" that allows the user to complete the properties, methods and events for a class to enter into code. Allowing the user to complete code with a method, property or event for a class as mentioned in col. 7 does not disclose user selectable preferences that provide different ways to display a representations of one proposed candidate.

The Examiner further cited the "code parameters" function of the code insight which allows the user to view the syntax of a method as the user enters it into code. (Sollich, col. 7, lines 33-35). Applicants submit that the cited function of allowing the user to view the syntax of a method does not disclose the claim requirement that different user selectable preferences specify different ways to display representations of one proposed candidates for the partial program instruction, such that the selected user selectable preference is used to configure how the representations of the proposed candidate are displayed. Instead, the cited "code parameter" function describes the use and function of "code insight" that allows the user to view the syntax of a method. Allowing the user to view the syntax of a method as mentioned in col. 7 does not disclose the claimed user selectable preferences that provide different ways to display representations of one proposed candidate.

Applicants submit that the cited functions of Code Insight are related toward features offered by code insight, and do not disclose the claimed user selectable preferences that provide different configurations to configure how the code assist functions displays representations of proposed candidates, where different preferences specify different ways to display representations of the proposed candidate.

Accordingly, amended claims 1, 7, and 13 are patentable over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Sollich.

2.   Claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Sollich (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,559). Applicants traverse.

First off, claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 7 or 13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 2, 8, and 14 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, and further require that the list of user-selectable preferences comprises a preference for displaying a longer list of candidates responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement and a preference for displaying a shorter list of candidates responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement.

The Examiner found that the additional requirements of these claims are obvious in view of Sollich because each programmer has a different programming style when it comes to syntax and some languages such as COBOL have different syntax for one single statement. To full the purpose of code assistance in COBOL, one would have been motivated to provide a programmer an option to select which syntax to use. (Final Office Action, pg. 8)

Applicants traverse this finding because the Examiner has not cited art that teaches or suggests a user selectable preference for configuring a code assist function to display a longer list or shorter list of proposed candidates. These Examiner's mention of different syntax for a single statement does not teach or suggest user selectable preferences for controlling how the list of proposed candidates is displayed, as a longer or a shorter list.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 2, 8, and 14 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Claims 3, 9, and 15 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, and further require that the list of user-selectable preferences comprises a preference for displaying a longer representation of a program instruction keyword candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement and a preference for displaying a shorter representation of a program instruction keyword candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement.

The Examiner found that the additional requirements of these claims are obvious in view of Sollich because each programmer has a different programming style when it comes to syntax and some languages such as COBOL have a plurality of ways to present the keywords, full or abbreviation. To full the purpose of code assistance in COBOL, one would have been motivated to provide a programmer an option to select which style to use, full or abbreviation of keywords. (Final Office Action, pg. 9)

Applicants traverse this finding because the Examiner has not cited any art that teaches or suggest a user selectable preference for configuring a code assist function to display a longer or shorter representation of a representation of a program instruction as a proposed candidate. Thus, the Examiner is not just using his proposed motivation to justify combining different references, but is using his proposed motivation to justify modifying a reference in a manner that is not taught or suggested in the cited art. For these reasons, Applicants submit that the proposed

modification is improper because the Examiner has not cited any art teaching or suggesting the proposed modification.

Accordingly, claims 3, 9, and 15 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited art.

Claims 4, 10, and 15 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, and further require that the list of user-selectable preferences comprises a preference for displaying a full syntax representation of a program instruction verb candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement and a preference for displaying a partial syntax representation of a program instruction verb candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement.

The Examiner found that the additional requirements of these claims are obvious in view of Sollich because each programmer has a different programming style when it comes to syntax and some languages such as COBOL have a plurality of ways to present the a statement (full or partial syntax). To fulfill the purpose of code assistance in COBOL, one would have been motivated to provide a programmer an option to select which style to use, full or partial syntax (Final Office Action, pg. 10)

Applicants traverse this finding because the Examiner has not cited any art that teaches or suggest a user selectable preference for configuring a code assist function to display a full or partial syntax representation of a program instruction as a proposed candidate. Thus, the Examiner is not just using his proposed motivation to justify combining different references, but is using his proposed motivation to justify modifying Sollich in a manner that is not taught or suggested in the cited art. For these reasons, Applicants submit that the proposed modification is improper because the Examiner has not cited any art teaching or suggesting the proposed modification.

Accordingly, claims 4, 10, and 16 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited art.

Claims 5, 11, and 17 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, and further require that the list of user-selectable preferences comprises a preference for displaying a lower-case representation of a program instruction candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement, a preference for displaying a upper-case syntax representation of a program instruction verb candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction

statement, and a preference for displaying a leading upper-case syntax representation of a program instruction verb candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement.

The Examiner found that the additional requirements of these claims are obvious in view of Sollich because each programmer has a different programming style and ways to present a statement (lower case or upper case or leading upper case). To fulfill the purpose of code assistance in COBOL, one would have been motivated to provide a programmer an option to select which style to use, lower case, upper case or leading upper case. (Final Office Action, pg. 11)

Applicants traverse this finding because the Examiner has not cited any art that teaches or suggest a user selectable preference for configuring a code assist function to display an upper or lower case presentation of a program instruction. Thus, the Examiner is not just using his proposed motivation to justify combining different references, but is using the proposed motivation to justify modifying Sollich in a manner that is not taught or suggested in the cited art. For these reasons, Applicants submit that the proposed modification is improper because the Examiner has not cited any art teaching or suggesting the proposed modification.

Accordingly, claims 5, 11, and 17 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited art.

3.   Claims 19, 20, and 21

Applicants amended claims 19, 20, and 21 to depend from claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, and further require: receiving user selection for verb specific selectable preferences for a selected verb; displaying a list of user selectable preferences of different ways to display the selected verb; and configuring the code assist function to display the selected verb for a partial program instruction according to the configuration provided by the selected one of the user selectable preferences, wherein selection of different user selectable preferences for different verbs causes the representation of the verbs in the code assist functions to be displayed in different ways.

The added requirements of these claims are disclosed on at least paras. [0055]-[0058] on pgs. 19-20 of the Specification.

Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 7, and 13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because the additional requirements of the added claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-21 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit herewith the fee for the added claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: June 13, 2007   By: /David Victor/

                                        Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David W. Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984